



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/541,718	04/03/2000	Borre Bengt Ulrichsen	P-340.3 Burrows	4824

7590 03/26/2003

John C Evans
Reising Ethington Barnes Kisselle
Learman & McCulloch PC
P O Box 4390
Troy, MI 48099-9998

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TUAN N

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3653

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 15

MAILED

Application Number: 09/541,718

MAR 26 2003

Filing Date: April 03, 2000

GROUP 3600

Appellant(s): Ulrichsen et al.

Ulrichsen et al.

For Appellant

Art Unit: 3653

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

1. This is in response to the appeal brief filed on January 06, 2003.
2. A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.
3. The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existance of any related appeals and interferences.
4. The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.
5. The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.
6. The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.
7. The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.
8. Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 144, 145, 168-171 and 174 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Art Unit: 3653

9. The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.
10. The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

484,221

European Patent Office

05-1992

11. Claims 144, 145, 168-171 and 174 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 8 mailed on June 11, 2002.

(12) - *Response to Argument*

Responding to appellants' argument, appellants have alleged that EPO'221 does not disclose scanning of a transverse section of a stream of matter at a detection station. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, and discussed on column 7, line 48 to column 8, line 28 (note radiation zone 22 containing detector array 20), EPO'221 does, indeed, disclose scanning of a transverse section of a stream of matter at a detection station. Appellants also have alleged that EPO'221 does not perform for each detection zone in respect of a plurality of the wavelengths simultaneously. Again, the Examiner disagrees. As broadly claimed, EPO'221 inherently does perform such function because if the wavelengths are not simultaneously, there would be gaps in between the wavelengths which is not desired. Re claim 145, the wavelength bands depend upon the physical and chemical properties of the items to be treated (column 7, lines 14-22). Re claim 174, EPO'221 is able to detect metallic materials as well as other non-metallic materials (column 1, lines 36-46); EPO'221 further discloses a receiving means 20 comprising a multiplicity of electromagnetic field sensing devices. Re claim 168, as broadly claimed, the receiving means can be considered an antenna. Re claim 169, an advancing means is a conveyor 17 or 18. Re claim 170, an emitting means 11 inherently has an oscillator. Re claim 171, the detection zone 22 comprises two-dimensional simulation (transversely and longitudinally) as shown in Fig. 2.

Art Unit: 3653

13. For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Tuan Nguyen

TUAN NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

3/24/03

March 24, 2003.